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Comment 159-5

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, an updated traffic technical report was prepared to reflect forecasts through 2030. It was provided to the City for review in June 2005. A copy of the revised traffic technical report is in Volume 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed project has undergone further refinement. The No Build Alternative is developed according to annual growth factors obtained from the SCAG socio-economic data. For the City of San Dimas, an annual growth factor of 1.06% was used. Since the SCAG data is being used, it is assumed that the proposed growth factor incorporates both ambient growth and cumulative projects within the City.

Comment 159-6

See Comment 159-5. The latest mitigation measure does not require acquisition of additional right-of-way, however, signalization of the intersection is proposed to mitigate impacts due to the project.

Comment 159-7

See Comment 159-5.

Comment 159-8

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the station location and parking in San Dimas were modified. The City of San Dimas has selected a site west of Eucla Avenue, north of Bonita Avenue (PDR, page 4-30) for the station and parking. This site was not included in the Draft. EIS/EIR, but has been evaluated in the Final EIS/EIR. See revised Chapter 3-10, Land Use, for an updated discussion on land use impacts.
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Comment 159-9

The Draft EIS/EIR was based upon conceptual level engineering. Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, additional information on utilities was provided to the City in June 2005.

COMMENT 159-10

The Planning Alternatives Analysis report cited is not germane. Landscaping is not a noise mitigation measure, since it does not provide sufficient bulk to shield or deflect noise. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a complete description of noise impacts that were evaluated, where impacts occur, and how they will be mitigated. The conditions of existing property walls along the rail right of way was considered in the analysis. As indicated in the revised Chapter 3-11.3, all noise impacts would be mitigated by soundwalls. The sounding of warning devices is governed by the CPUC, which does not currently allow the substitution of flashing lights for warning bells.

Operation of the proposed project is not subject to the City’s noise ordinance. The Construction Authority adopted a policy on March 17, 2005, that construction of the Foothill Extension would be subject to each corridor city’s noise ordinance.
**Comment 159-11**

As stated in the EIS/EIR, landscaping will be provided within the rail right of way, consistent with that provided in Phase I. If the proposed project is implemented, the right of way will be under much greater use and receive higher levels of maintenance than current conditions; illegal dumping would be unlikely to occur.

**Comment 159-12**

The LACMTA Master Bikeway Plan was developed before current planning for the Foothill Extension began and has subsequently been amended by participating cities to recognize that if the proposed project is implemented, the planned bikeway cannot co-exist within the rail right of way because of safety concerns. The bikeway was relocated to be an on-street facility and planning continues on a low-level for this project. The Foothill Extension stations will provide connections with pedestrian and bike facilities.

**Comment 159-13**

Since the Draft EIS/EIR was released, the potential LRT station adjacent to the depot has been eliminated from consideration. On February 22, 2005, the City of San Dimas selected a site west of Eucla Avenue, north of Bonita Avenue (PDR, page 4-30). The new site precludes impacts to the historic depot. This site was not included in the Draft EIS/EIR, but has been evaluated in the Final EIS/EIR. See revised Chapter 2, Alternatives for further information.
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Ms. Susan Hodor
June 17, 2004

Alternative Station Locations

Due to the lack of available vacant land to meet the possible initial ridership parking demands, the impact of traffic on residential neighborhoods, the possibility of difficulties in meeting the 180-foot distance requirements (i.e., locating the station platform at least 180 feet from a street intersection) which may require closeness of Monte Vista Avenue (impacting the residential neighborhood to the south), and being too close to Bonita/Catactac intersection may impede traffic flows, the City requests that the following additional properties located south of the railroad right-of-way be further analyzed for station consideration:

1. Existing San Dimas Park and Ride lot (between Monte Vista Avenue and San Dimas Avenue). (See Attachment C).
2. Vacant and undeveloped property on the east side of San Dimas Avenue. (See Attachment D).

Both locations provide the following numerous advantages:

- Adequate frontage for station
- Located on major north/south arterial (San Dimas Avenue), providing optimal local and regional access to north and south sides of the City and to freeways
- Near Downtown areas
- Parking structure possibilities
- Parking structure at rear of commercial properties.

At both locations, the City requests that, in conjunction with parking structures on the properties, consideration would also be given to a parking structure that will straddle across the existing 100-foot right-of-way, which could possibly generate 150 additional parking spaces directly over the station.

However, for any new parking structure design, the visual impacts should receive a general mitigation.

Should you wish to discuss this matter, please feel free to contact me at (909) 394-6240.

Sincerely,

Krishna Patel
Director of Public Works

cc: Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
    Larry Stevens, Director of Community Development
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Comment 159-14
Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, consultation with the City of San Dimas resulted in the selection of a site on Eucla as the preferred LRT station site. See revised Chapter 2, Alternatives.

Comment 159-15
Parking would be provided on property adjoining the rail right of way, but would not be provided in an elevated structure over the right of way. On February 22, 2005, the City of San Dimas selected parking in a structure to be located north of the rail alignment and west of Eucla Avenue.

Comment 159-16
Mitigation measures associated with parking facilities are described in revised Chapter 3-17, Visual Impacts.
No responses to comments provided for a Notice of Preparation are required under CEQA.
Ms. Susan Hodor
Page 2
July 24, 2003

3. Traffic and Use
   • Impacts associated with the development of an intermodal station in the city along the extension to be served by the Gold Line.

4. Hydrology
   • The EIR should address impacts created on existing storm drains and culvert system crossing by the proposed project.

5. Noise and Vibration
   • Noise and vibration is identified in the Planning Alternative Analysis report as a significant issue. All feasible mitigation measures should be addressed including a mitigation measure that considers landscaping within the railroad right-of-way.

6. Other Items
   • The cities of San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona and Claremont have received MTA funding and are in the Planning Stage of developing a Class 1 Bikeway along the railroad right-of-way. This bikeway is a part of the MTA and the City of San Dimas' master plan. The EIR must analyze the impacts of the proposed project on this bikeway. In addition, the bikeway and associated landscape and amenities may be able to be used as mitigation of project impacts.

   Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please feel free to contact me at (909) 394-6240.

   Sincerely,

   Krishna Patel
   Director of Public Works

   c: Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
## Level of Service Results Under Various Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing Traffic</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Build</th>
<th>Build to Irwindale</th>
<th>Proposed Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Hill/Gladstone</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita/Luella</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita/Acacia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita/Catalina</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Signalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita/Monte Vista</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Signalization, Restripe &amp; widen eastbound Bonita to provide left turn lane and 2 through lanes and right turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita/San Dimas Av</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow/San Dimas Av</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow/Walnut</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorba/San Dimas Canyon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that unacceptable levels of service (worse than LOS) are forecast for three intersections on Bonita Avenue (at Acacia, Catalina and Monte Vista). The following are comments about and concerns the proposed mitigation measures:

- The justification for signalization at the Catalina and Monte Vista intersections appears to be based on the delay that north-south drivers will experience due to the future volume forecasts on Bonita Avenue regardless of whether the LRT is constructed or not. The study does not actually address whether the north-south volumes would satisfy any of the accepted warrants for signalization.

- The justification for signalization at the Acacia intersection appears to be based on the delay that north-south drivers will experience due to the future volume forecasts on Bonita Avenue if the LRT is constructed. The study does not actually address whether the north-south volumes would satisfy any of the accepted warrants for signalization.

- At Catalina, the mitigation will require modification of the intersection geometrics to implement signalization.

- At Monte Vista, the proposed widening does not appear to be feasible given the impact it would have on the existing character of the downtown area.

- Track improvement construction in the vicinity of the Bonita/Catalina intersection will require closure of the streets. Therefore, it would be performed at night to minimize traffic impacts.
ATTACHMENT D

Vacant Undeveloped Property East of San Dimas Avenue

Bonita Avenue

Extent of LRT Platform

MTA Right of Way
Comment 160-1

Comments from the Director of Community Development are acknowledged and are responded to in Comments 160-2, et seq.
Comment Letter 160

Comment 160-2

The Draft EIR met all requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. It provides information on the anticipated environmental impacts of the proposed project. The document, which covers an alignment of 24 miles and 12 cities, was organized with a series of headings to guide readers to those sections of the document that apply to the City of San Dimas. Where adverse effects under NEPA, or significant impacts under CEQA were identified, potential mitigation measures were described. Changes to the proposed project that have occurred subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR, along with impacts associated with these changes and detailed mitigation measures, are described in the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment 160-3

The traffic impact analysis in Chapter 3-15, Traffic and Transportation, reported the impacts to San Dimas Avenue and Bonita Avenue. (See Table 3-15.11, Table 3-15.14, and Table 3-15.15). Additionally, a Grade Crossing Preliminary Hazard analysis was completed for all grade crossings along the alignment and resulted in intersection and crossing improvements to improve safety and to allow optimal operation of the crossings and streets. No need for a grade crossing at Bonita/Cataract was shown based on traffic conditions. On February 22, 2005, the San Dimas City Council concurred that grade separation was not warranted (PDR, page 4-32).

See Comment 159-5 regarding an updated traffic technical analysis. Please see revised Chapter 3-15, Traffic and Transportation, for more information.
COMMENT LETTER 160

RESPONSE TO LETTER 160

Comment 160-4
See Comment 159-5 regarding an updated traffic technical analysis. The latest mitigation measure does not require acquisition of additional right-of-way. The signalization of Bonita Ave/Monte Vista Ave intersection will mitigate traffic conditions to LOS A and will have no significant impact to downtown San Dimas. The re-stripping proposed at the SR-57 NB Ramps and Bonita/Arrow Hwy can be accommodated within existing right of way.

Comment 160-5
See Comment 159-5 regarding an updated traffic technical analysis. The latest mitigation measure does not require restripping in the downtown area.

Comment 160-6
See Comment 159-5 regarding an updated traffic technical analysis. The latest proposed mitigation measure does not require acquisition of additional right-of-way.

Comment 160-7
The year 2030 SCAG model output was utilized to determine the growth factors. The study area was analyzed based upon: anticipated intersection operation, historical traffic data, potential population and employment growth within each city, and all impacts from new developments. Generally, the future land use shown in the SCAG model reflects ambient growth and cumulative traffic. These models are standard and include localized impacts.
**COMMENT LETTER 160**

Problem at this location with much greater separation between trains. The idea of increasing lanes on west bound Bonita Avenue is not acceptable to the City.

Signalization of Bonita and Monte Vista is also proposed. The impacts on the San Dimas downtown are not considered.

Re-stripping in the downtown is not an acceptable mitigation.

Also, there is the potential to need additional ROW at Monte Vista and Bonita Avenue. What will this do to the downtown area?

Impact on the closing of Monte Vista. It appears in several of the plans that there is a proposal to close Monte Vista. This will impact the residential neighborhood to the south.

**Cumulative traffic impacts.** No adequate discussion of this item. Traffic analysis does not consider impacts of any new development since projections appear to only be based on current growth. The entire traffic analysis is superficial and does not adequately consider localized impacts.

**Impacts of parking lot and station traffic.** Since parking is required for the stations, an complete circulation analysis is warranted. Will there be a need for additional or revised signalization, new traffic lanes?

**Impact on other plans.** We had requested that the EIR analyze the impact on the MTA Bicycle Master Plan that includes a regional trail in the ROW and do not see the analysis.

**Cultural Resources.**

The EIR does not correctly assume the impact on the existing Historic Santa Fe Depot. The two track alternative proposes a platform within three feet four inches on the existing depot. This will, most likely, create a potential impact that is in need of mitigation. This is not to say that the platform location is inappropriate, but that the design offered may be a detriment to further preservation without adequate mitigation.

Mitigation also may be warranted for the three track alternative as location of a station on the Lemon Packing House property may create the potential for impact on the building.

The point being, to determine that there will be no significant impact without mitigation is a stretch.

---

**RESPONSE TO LETTER 160**

**Comment 160-8**

The impact of parking lot and station traffic has been addressed and reflected in the distribution of trips to and from the station area. The traffic impact on nearby major intersections was analyzed and the results are shown in the Mitigation part. Other intersections are minor ones and not include in the analysis.

**Comment 160-9**

See Comment 159-12.

**Comment 160-10**

See Comment 159-13.

**Comment 160-11**

Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, the potential LRT station adjacent to the packing warehouse has been eliminated from consideration. On February 22, 2005, the City of San Dimas selected a site west of Eucla Avenue, north of Bonita Avenue (PDR, page 4-30). This site was not included in the Draft EIS/EIR, but has been evaluated in the Final EIS/EIR. See revised Chapter 2, Alternatives for further information.
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Comment 160-12
The noise impact analysis included all residential areas along the right of way. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a complete description of how noise impacts were evaluated, where impacts occur, and how they will be mitigated.

Comment 160-13
Noise from station operations and parking is included in the noise impact analysis.

Comment 160-14
See Comment 160-12.

Comment 160-15
Noise impacts are assessed in accordance with the criteria of the Federal Transit Administration. The criteria of local jurisdictions are not applicable, since neither the federal or state Lead Agencies are subject to local ordinances.

Comment 160-16
The potential visual impact of overhead wires is acknowledged and is discussed in Chapter 3-17, Visual Impacts. The Construction Authority agrees that the visual impact, because of the subjective nature of assessing impacts, can be considered an unavoidable significant impact under CEQA. The Construction Authority will address this issue in the Statement of Overriding Considerations as part of project approval.
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Comment 160-17

Mitigation measures associated with parking facilities are described in revised Chapter 3-17, Visual Impacts.
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Comment 161-1

FAA’s comment that no Airway Facilities would be affected by the proposed LRT project is acknowledged.
Comment 162-1

Please see revised Chapter 3-3, Biological Resources, for an updated discussion of impacts to alluvial sage scrub habitat.
RESPONSE TO LETTER 162

Comment 162-2
Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Operations and Maintenance Facility has been reduced in size from that reported in the Draft EIS/EIR; however, it will still be at the same location. There are no alternative sites within the corridor. Please see revised Section 3-3.3 for proposed mitigation.

Comment 162-3
Please see revised Chapter 3-3, Biological Resources, for a discussion of surveys and results.

Comment 162-4
No California junipers were found during site surveys.

Comment 162-5
Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Triple Track Configuration that would cross the San Gabriel River was eliminated from consideration due to the pending relocation of the Monrovia Granary. The Final EIS/EIR discusses impacts to all biologically sensitive resources affected by the proposed project. See revised Chapter 3-3, Biological Resources.
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Appendix 1

Alluvial fan sage scrub of the San Gabriel River was described by Smith (1980) as distinctive because of its structural and floral diversity, attributed to the concurrence of species of both desert and coastal affinities. For example, a number of California junipers (Juniperus californica) are known to occur in the vicinity of the proposed project site (Mickey Long, pers. comm., May 11, 2004). This species typically occurs on desert slopes and is highly unusual on the coastal side of Los Angeles County. Lemonade berry (Rhus integrifolia), primarily a coastal species, is also found in this area (Smith 1980).

The slender-horned spineflower (Dodecatheon leptoceras) historically occurred throughout the San Gabriel River Floodplain in association with alluvial fan sage scrub; however, no populations are currently known from this watershed. The loss of alluvial fan sage scrub habitat led to the listing of this species as federally endangered on September 28, 1987 (52 FR 36270).

Alluvial fan sage scrub has been identified by the California Department of Fish and Game’s California Natural Diversity Data Base as “very threatened” (CNDDB, 2003).
COMMENT LETTER 163

Gold Line Foothill Extension
Construction Authority
408 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, CA 91016

ATTN: Habib Balian, Administrative Manager
RE: Comments to the DEIS/DEIR

Dear Sir:
The City has completed its review of the documents and provides the following comments:

1. **Three Track Option**
The three track, one freight and two light rail, configuration is not an acceptable option. The City will pursue, with cooperation from the Construction Authority, the relocation of the Monrovia grainary that necessitates the three track option.

The relocation of the grainary east of the Miller Brewery provides significant project cost savings. The relocation eliminates the need for constructing 3 track bridge structures over the San Gabriel River and San Gabriel Wash; cost reductions for freeway bridge safety improvements; cost reductions in 5 street crossings; and eliminates having tracks pass on both sides of the historic Monrovia Depot.

The City supports the Two Track Option as presented.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,
Douglas Brennan,
City Engineer

415 South Ivy Avenue • Monrovia, California 91016-2888 • (626) 932-5575 • FAX (626) 932-5589
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Comment 163-1

The City’s opposition to the Triple Track Configuration and support for the Double Track Configuration is acknowledged. Since the Draft EIS/EIR was released, the project has undergone planning refinements. Due to the planned relocation of the grainary in Monrovia that required frequent freight service, the triple track option west of the Miller Brewing Company has been eliminated.
Comment 164-1

The concept of a loop linking the northern and southern alignments at the eastern terminus was considered and eliminated. The southern alignment option (concurrent with Metrolink’s San Bernardino line) was selected as the preferred alignment for serving Montclair. The City Council of Montclair approved the location of the station to be north of the existing Metrolink platform (PDR, page 4-47) and concurred with the southern alignment (PDR, page 4-49). Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives.

Comment 164-2

Responses to comments from Robert Clerk, the City’s Community Development Director, can be found in comments Public Hearing 5-1 and 5-2.

Comment 164-3

See Comment 164-1.
Staff Report

CITY OF LA VERNE
Community Development Department

DATE: June 9, 2004
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Community Development Department
SUBJECT: GOLD LINE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS
OPEN HOUSE AND PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA SUMMARY

Gold Line staff will hold an open house from 5:30 to 6:30 to explain various aspects of the proposed Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report to interested members of the public, staff, and commissioners. The Commission will then begin its normal meeting, with the first hearing being a public hearing for the Gold Line EIS/EIR. The Commission will invite comments and questions, which will be recorded and addressed in the final EIS/EIR. Staff has included comments regarding traffic, visual effects, cultural resources, and station location. Staff strongly supports this project and believes that by increasing transportation options, the Gold Line will help to create a healthier, more balanced and more interesting region and city.

1. EIS/EIR BACKGROUND

Habib Italian, Intero CEO, Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Authority, and other members of the Gold Line team will provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/DEIR) for the Metro Gold Line Phase II: Pasadena to Montclair project, also known as the Foothill Extension, which was released to the public on April 30, 2004.

The proposed 24-mile extension of the operating light rail system will connect Pasadena to Montclair in San Bernardino County, with proposed stations in the cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and Montclair. The required 45-day public comment period began on May 7 and will end at midnight on June 21, 2004. During this time, comments will be solicited and received by the Authority for inclusion into the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIS/FEIR). Key stakeholders in the city and all property owners 500 feet to the north and 500 feet to the south of the right of way were notified about this public hearing and invited to provide input.

Gold Line staff will hold an open house at 5:30. At 6:30, following the open house, the Planning Commission meeting will begin, and a public hearing on the environmental documents will be held. Mr. Habib will make a short formal presentation of the environmental findings, after which
public comments and questions will be invited by the Commission and documented by a court reporter. In addition to submitting comments at the public hearing, the public may mail comments directly to the Authority at 625 Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 200, South Pasadena, California 91030, or submit them on the Authority’s website at www.goldlineextension.com or e-mailed directly to info@goldline.com.

Each Planning Commissioner was mailed a copy of the Executive Summary during the first week of June. Copies of the complete DEIS/DEIR are available for public review at the Authority’s website in pdf format; at the branch libraries in each city including the La Verne Public Library at 3640 D Street; and in the Community Development Department in CD format and in printed form.

II. FUNDING AND GOVERNANCE

With regard to funding of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension, there is an ongoing and increasingly successful effort by the 11 Phase II cities, the COG, and their advocates and representatives in Washington to secure federal funding for this project. Local matching funds will have to be secured as well.

Governance, which involves granting decision-making authority to the cities along the Foothill Extension, is still being worked out and has yet to be resolved. The key may be SB12 (Lisa) which would revise prior legislation that created the Blue Line Construction Authority that built Phase I. It would charter the 11 Phase II cities into groups with 3 or 4 representatives on the Authority Board, and retain the MTA as a member with 2 or 3 seats.

III. SCHEDULE

After the public comment period for the draft EIS/EIR has ended, the Authority will catalogue all public comments received and begin preparing the response to comments required in the Final EIS/EIR document, expected to be completed in the summer of 2005. Completion of the environmental process coincides with the completion of preliminary engineering, which will be at a 30-50 percent design level at that time.

Once funding is achieved, the Authority will be in a position to release a contract to finish the design and construct the project. The Phase I design-build model will likely be used again for the Foothill Extension. The project will be constructed in two segments. Segment 1, from Pasadena to Irwindale where a maintenance facility will be located, is anticipated to last 3-4 years and could begin as early as 2006 assuming no delays in funding or project schedule. Segment 2, which includes La Verne, is anticipated to begin in 2009 and be completed in 2014.

IV. LA VERNE ISSUES

During the past six months and more, the Authority and its technical consultants have met with staff from the City of La Verne to discuss the preliminary findings of the environmental analysis and discuss station planning issues such as parking and traffic circulation. The EIS/EIR identifies 2 potential station sites in the City of La Verne. One is a platform located east of the...
Response to Comments

COMMENT LETTER 165

RESPONSE TO LETTER 165

Comment 165-1
Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the station location options were reduced to a single location. On February 22, 2005, the La Verne City Council concurred on the E Street location (PDR, page 4-35).

Comment 165-2
The proposed station location at Arrow and Wheeler is a park, and under Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act would not be a viable station site since there are alternative sites that would not involve the use of dedicated park land.

Comment 165-3
Additional information provided by the City regarding cultural resources has been included in the Final EIS/EIR documentation.

Comment 165-4
Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, an updated traffic technical report was prepared to reflect forecasts through 2030. It was provided to the City for review in June 2005. A copy of the revised traffic technical report is in Volume V of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment 165-5
The potential location of Metrolink tracks within the Construction Authority right of way was evaluated and eliminated from further consideration. The final configuration of the alignment would be 2 LRT tracks on the south side of the alignment and 1 freight track on the north (PDR, page 4-36).
COMMENT LETTER 165
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Comment 165-6

The current level of conceptual engineering indicates that most of the deodar cedars can be avoided. Some will need to be trimmed to avoid encroaching onto the safety envelope required for the LRT vehicle. Other landscaping of the right-of-way will be provided; the City will be provided opportunities to consult on the nature of this landscaping.

Respectfully submitted,
Hal G. Frederickson

By: Afere Andrew
Senior Planner

Attachment: Warren Siecke’s comments on traffic
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Comment 166-1

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the station location options were reduced to a single location. On February 22, 2005, the La Verne City Council concurred on the E Street location (PDR, page 4-35). Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, an updated traffic technical report was prepared to reflect forecasts through 2030. It was provided to the City for review in June 2005. A copy of the revised traffic technical report is in Volume V of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment 166-2

Ridership among station options would not be likely to vary, given that the station options in the Draft EIS/EIR were within a few blocks of each other.

Comment 166-3

See Comment 166-1.

Comment 166-4

See Comment 166-1.
- The justification for signalization as a mitigation measure does not consider the existing warrants for signalization. It appears to be based on the delay that drivers experience at the cross streets at White Avenue or Arrow Highway. The study should provide a signal warrant analysis to back up the recommendations for signalization.

- The mitigation measures for White Avenue at First Street, Second Street and Third Street should be clarified. The term "no change" implies that widening is not required. However, the reference to "about 2 ft of right-of-way may be reduced" indicates widening will be required. If widening is proposed, the measure should be described as "widen and re-stripe."

- The traffic impacts during construction will be mitigated through plans that will specify incomplete traffic control and reconfiguration, text to be added.

I believe additional study should be conducted to verify the differences in traffic impacts that may (or may not) be associated with station locations D, C, and E.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Note:**
- Gender: F for Female, M for Male
- Race: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian
- Age: 25, 30, 40, 50
- Education: Bachelor, High School, Master, PhD
- Marital Status: Single, Married
- Income Level: Low, Medium, High
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Comment PH 1-1

No residential property acquisitions are planned in Duarte. The parcels needed for parking and traction power substation are commercial.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 1-2

The parking structure proposed in the Draft EIS/EIR has been eliminated. As reported in the Final EIS/EIR, surface parking will be provided to the north of the station, accessible from Business Center Drive.

Comment PH 1-3

See Comment PH 1-2.
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Comment PH 2-1

The addresses of properties to be acquired is listed in revised Chapter 3-1.

Comment PH 2-2

No grade separations of streets are planned. A Grade Hazard analysis was completed, and is reported in the revised Chapter 3-15, Traffic. The analysis showed that no grade separations were warranted.

Comment PH 2-3

No other development would occur on the LRT station site itself other than transit facilities. Some cities are planning on future development adjoining the LRT station; assessing the environmental impacts of that future development would be the responsibility of each city.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 2-4

Traffic impacts are reported in revised Chapter 3-15.

Comment PH 2-5

Two copies of the Final EIS/EIR will be provided to each library. However, whether or not documents can be checked out is each library’s policy.

Comment PH 2-6

The distribution of notices was determined by each city.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 2-7

See revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a discussion of impacts and mitigation.

Comment PH 2-8

The warning devices used on LRT vehicles are much different than on freight trains. Please see revised Chapter 3-11 for more information.

satisfied that the appropriate grade separations or precautions are in place for our young folks.

That's all I have.

MR. MERRIMAN: My name is Tom Merriman, and I live at 927 East Ada Avenue.

And the only thing I'm really interested in is somebody who lives about 250 yards away from the line and from a crossing, that is the crossing at Route 66 or Alosta Avenue and Elwood with regard to noise, not so much mechanical noise, not the actual operation of the train itself. I'm not looking forward, presuming I'm still here in ten years, to listening to a screechy whistle maybe up to what would that be, a thousand times a day perhaps, and the mechanical noise is going to be somewhat annoying to the people who live on Lemon Avenue and perhaps even up on Walnut. I think it will probably be pretty much dampened by the sound of a whistle that travels quite far and can make it all the way up to Foothill Avenue, and that's quite a distance, and I was wondering if any consideration has been given to that. That's not specifically mentioned among the mitigations that are addressed in the documents that are here tonight.

MS. NIXON: My name is Marilyn Nixon. I live at Barranca and the railroad track, and so our concern of our homeowners in this Foothill Village is the sound, not of
Response to Comment

Comment PH 2-9

Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration for information on this issue.

Comment PH 2-10

Your support for the proposed project is acknowledged.

Comment PH 2-11

Please see the revised Chapter 5 for the schedule for implementation.
GLENDORA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

Response to Comment

Comment PH 2-12

Please see the revised Chapter 5 for the schedule for implementation.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 2-13

The roadway name has been corrected.
GLENDORA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 2-14

Please see revised Chapter 3-15, Noise and Vibration for information on this issue.

Comment PH 2-15

LRT vehicles would typically pass through an intersection in less than 45 seconds; thus roadways would not be blocked for 14 percent of the time. Please see revised Chapter 3-15 for information on traffic performance of intersections.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 2-16

Please see revised Chapter 3-11 for information on noise impacts and mitigation. There is no tunneling proposed for the Foothill Extension.

Comment PH 2-17

The Sierra Club support for the project is acknowledged.

Comment PH 2-18

Pedestrian and bicycle access to the proposed LRT stations would primarily be the responsibility of each city. Please see revised Chapter 3-15 for information on traffic.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 2-19

Please see revised Chapter 3-11 for information on this issue.

Comment PH 2-20

Please see revised Chapter 3-2 for information on air quality benefits.

Comment PH 2-21

Please see revised Chapter 3-15 for information on traffic in each city.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 2-22

The appearance of the Glendora station will be a cooperative effort between the Construction Authority and the City. A design review committee has been established.

Comment PH 2-23

Please see revised Chapter 3-13 for information on the locations of noise walls.